

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13, 15-27 and 29-34 are pending in this application. No amendments have been made.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1-6, 33 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as not adequately described in the specification.

These rejections are traversed as follows:

The Examiner has found that the subject matter of claims 1-6 and 33-34 is not described in the specification so as to enable a person skilled in the art to which these claims pertain, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention. In particular, the Examiner fails to find support in the specification on how to use one digit to derive an input sequence or a PIN. Moreover, the Examiner notes that claim 6 implies deriving a telephone number from one digit.

Support for these claims, sufficient to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention claimed is found throughout the written description. Most particularly, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 5, line 20 through line 33 which describes dividing a conference ID into an input sequence of digits or a PIN. The examples illustrated by the tables on pages 8 and 9 are also pertinent and provide additional enablement.

It is of no moment that the limiting case of a one digit first portion and a one digit second portion of the conference ID is covered by the claim. That simply means that the first portion of the conference ID maps to one of ten numbers, while the second portion also maps to one of ten numbers, assuming that decimal digits are used. The number of digits in the sequence mapped to is arbitrary, although it could be a conventional, North American style telephone number having ten digits or it could be a single digit extension in a system including a very small number of subscribers. In any case, the written description adequately enables one skilled in the art to make and use the invention because it teaches several alternative mapping techniques and the skilled artisan will be familiar with others.

Claims 1-6, 33 and 34 are directed to subject matter that is fully described in the specification in such a manner as to enable the skilled artisan to which is pertains, or with which is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention claimed. Therefore, these claims meet all of the requirements of § 112, first paragraph.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-6, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

#### Allowable Subject Matter


The Applicant acknowledges, with appreciation, the Examiner's finding that all of the pending claims, claims 1-13, 15-27 and 29-34, would be allowable if the rejection of claims 1-6, 33 and 34 were overcome.

#### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762.

Respectfully submitted,  
*Andrew L. Stern et al., Applicant*

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary S. Engelson, Reg. No. 35,128  
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP  
One Main Street  
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142  
Telephone: 617-395-7000  
Facsimile: 617-395-7070

Date: August 9, 2004